UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,485	09/20/2000	Koji Tezuka	FUSA 17.777	7153

26304 7590 10/02/2003	**EXAMINER**	
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN	DUONG, OANH L	
575 MADISON AVENUE	**ART UNIT**	**PAPER NUMBER**
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585	2155	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/666,485	TEZUKA ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Oanh L. Duong	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 September 2000* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) *1, 3, 7 and 8* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *2 and 4-6* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 1-2 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 1, "the parameters" in lines 12-13 lacks of antecedent basis;

these parameters in lines 15-16 are not clear

Regarding claim 2, "the same" in line 5 is not being clear.

Appropriate correction is required.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 2-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Taguchi et al (Taguchi) (US 6,539,432 B1) in view of Mahon et al (Mahon) (US

2003/0115246 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Taguchi teaches a communication network system for converting action parameters contained in policy information obtained by abstracting network-related user requirements to parameters conforming to network technology and type of network element, and setting these parameters in the network element (e.g., see col. 11 line 13-col. 12 line 47), said system comprising means for converting the parameters to parameters dependent upon type of network element and setting these dependent parameters in the network element (Taguchi, see e.g., see col. 8 line 42-col. 10 line 33). Taguchi does not explicitly teaches means for converting action parameters contained in the abstracted policy information to network technology dependent parameters. However, Mahon teaches comprising means for converting action parameters contained in the abstracted policy information to network technology dependent parameters (e.g., see page 2 paragraphs 27-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the conversion means in the system of Taguchi as taught by Mahon because such conversion means would provide information that managed item can recognize and conform with. This would have improved the flexibility in assignment of policy to the network services being managed (Mahon, see page 1 paragraph 4).

Regarding claim 3, Taguchi teaches policy enforcement means for receiving the network technology dependent parameters from the first conversion means and setting, in a network element, element dependent parameters obtained by converting the network technology dependent parameters (e.g., see col. col. 12 lines 41-47); and conversion rules storage means for storing conversion rules used when the network

technology dependent parameters are converted to element dependent parameters (e.g., see col. 11 lines 44-49); and conversion means for selecting a conversion rule conforming to type of network element and converting the network technology dependent parameters to element dependent parameters using the selected conversion rule (e.g., see col. 16 lines 26-31).

Regarding claim 7, Taguchi teaches said rule-conversion storage means stores conversion rules on a per-element-type basis (e.g., see fig. 9 col. 8 lines 57-4); and said conversion means selects a conversion rule based on the type of element and converts network technology dependent parameters to element-dependent parameters using the selected conversion rule (e.g., see col. 9 line 5-col. 10 line 33).

Regarding claim 8, Taguchi teaches conversion-rule storage means adds on a conversion rule whenever a function of a network element is added on or changed (e.g., see col. 10 lines 29-33); and said conversion means selects a prescribed conversion rule upon taking the function of a network element or the umber of versions of a network element into consideration, and converts the network technology dependent parameters to the element dependent parameters using the selected conversion rule (e.g., see col. 5 lines 42-60).

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh L. Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

O.D
September 24, 2003

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER